

Generalized Stäckel Transform and Reciprocal Transformations for Finite-Dimensional Integrable Systems

Artur Sergyeyev¹ and Maciej Błaszak²

¹Mathematical Institute, Silesian University in Opava,
Na Rybníčku 1, 746 01 Opava, Czech Republic

²Institute of Physics, A. Mickiewicz University,
Umultowska 85, 61-614 Poznań, Poland

E-mail: Artur.Sergyeyev@math.slu.cz and blaszakm@amu.edu.pl

December 21, 2007

We present a multiparameter generalization of the Stäckel transform (the latter is also known as the coupling-constant metamorphosis) and show that under certain conditions this generalized Stäckel transform preserves Liouville integrability, noncommutative integrability and superintegrability. The corresponding transformation for the equations of motion proves to be nothing but a reciprocal transformation of a special form, and we investigate the properties of this reciprocal transformation.

Finally, we show that the Hamiltonians of the systems possessing separation curves of apparently very different form can be related through a suitably chosen generalized Stäckel transform.

Keywords: multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform, integrable systems, separation curves, reciprocal transformation

1 Introduction

The Stäckel transform [11], also known as the coupling-constant metamorphosis [18], cf. also [20, 21, 22, 35, 36] for more recent developments, is a powerful tool for producing new Liouville integrable systems from the known ones. This is essentially a transformation that sends an n -tuple of functions in involution on a $2n$ -dimensional symplectic manifold into another n -tuple of functions on the same manifold, and these n new functions are again in involution. In its original form the Stäckel transform affects just one coupling constant which enters the Hamiltonian linearly and interchanges this constant with the energy eigenvalue, see [11, 18].

In the present paper we introduce a multiparameter generalization of the classical Stäckel transform, which, just like its known counterpart, enables us to generate new Liouville integrable systems from the known ones or bring known integrable systems into a simpler form. Unlike the original Stäckel transform [11, 18] this *multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform* allows for the Hamiltonians being *nonlinear* functions of *several* parameters. These properties considerably increase the power of the transform in question.

Most importantly, under certain natural assumptions the multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform preserves Liouville integrability, superintegrability and noncommutative integrability, see Propositions 1 and 2 and the discussion thereafter.

Moreover, in Section 4 we show that the transformations for equations of motion induced by the multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform are nothing but reciprocal transformations. This generalizes to the multiparameter case the earlier results of Hietarinta et al. [18] on the one-parameter Stäckel transform.

The significance of reciprocal transformations in the theory of integrable nonlinear partial differential equations is well recognized. These transformations were intensively used in the theory of dispersionless (hydrodynamic-type) systems as well as in the theory of soliton systems, see e.g. [29, 31] and references therein. On the other hand, some particular examples of transformations of this kind for finite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems are also known, for instance the Jacobi transformation, see [24] and a recent survey [36]. The reciprocal transformations of somewhat different kind have also appeared in [18, 38, 35].

In the present paper we consider reciprocal transformations for the Liouville integrable Hamiltonian systems in conjunction with the generalized Stäckel transform and, in contrast with the earlier work on the subject, we concentrate on the multi-time version of these transformations.

In fact, as we show in Section 4 below, these transformations, when applied to the equations of motion of the source system, in general do *not* yield the equations of motion for the target system *unless* we restrict the equations of motion onto the common level surface of the corresponding Hamiltonians, see Propositions 3 and 4 below for details.

We further show that for two Liouville integrable systems related by an appropriate multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform for the constants of motion we have the reciprocal transformation relating the corresponding equations of motion restricted to appropriate Lagrangian submanifolds, see e.g. Ch.3 of [12] and references therein for more details on the latter.

Moreover, we present a multitime extension of the original reciprocal transformation from [18], and study the applications of this extended transformation to the integration of equations of motion in the Hamilton–Jacobi formalism using the separation of variables, cf. [11].

In the rest of the paper we consider the relations among classical Liouville integrable Stäckel systems on $2n$ -dimensional phase space. In [7] infinitely many classes of the Stäckel systems related to the so-called seed class, namely, the k -hole deformations of the latter, were constructed. Here we show that any k -hole deformation can be obtained from the Benenti-type system through a suitably chosen multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform, and present the explicit form of the transform in question along with its inverse.

2 Multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform: definition and duality

Let (M, P) be a Poisson manifold with the Poisson bracket $\{f, g\} = (df, Pdg)$. Consider r functionally independent Hamiltonians H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, on M , and assume that these Hamiltonians further depend on $k \leq r$ parameters $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$, so

$$H_i = H_i(x, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k), \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad (1)$$

where $x \in M$. Note that in general r is not related in any way to the dimension of M except for the obvious restriction $r \leq \dim M$; see, however, the discussion after Proposition 1. Also, in what follows all functions will be tacitly assumed to be smooth (of the C^∞ class).

Suppose that there exists a k -tuple of pairwise distinct numbers $s_i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that

$$\det (\|\partial H_{s_i}/\partial \alpha_j\|_{i,j=1,\dots,k}) \neq 0. \quad (2)$$

Now fix a k -tuple $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ such that (2) holds and consider the system

$$H_{s_i}(x, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = \tilde{\alpha}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ are arbitrary parameters, as a system of algebraic equations for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$. By the implicit function theorem, the condition (2) guarantees that the solution of this system exists and is (locally) unique. We can write this solution in the form

$$\alpha_i = A_i(x, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k), \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Now define the new Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_{s_i} , $i = 1, \dots, k$, by setting

$$\tilde{H}_{s_i} = A_i(x, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k), \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

In other words, the Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_{s_i} , $i = 1, \dots, k$ are defined by means of the relations

$$H_{s_i}|_{[\Phi]} = \tilde{\alpha}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (3)$$

Here and below the subscript $[\Phi]$ means that we have substituted \tilde{H}_{s_i} for α_i for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Next, let

$$\tilde{H}_i = H_i|_{[\Phi]}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad i \neq s_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k. \quad (4)$$

Note that the Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_j involve k parameters $\tilde{\alpha}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ for all $j = 1, \dots, r$:

$$\tilde{H}_i = \tilde{H}_i(x, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k), \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

We shall refer to the above transformation from H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, to \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, as to the k -parameter *generalized Stäckel transform* generated by H_{s_1}, \dots, H_{s_k} . In analogy with [11] we shall say that the r -tuples H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, and \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, are *Stäckel-equivalent*.

The condition (2) guarantees that the above transformation is invertible. Indeed, consider the dual of the identity (3), that is,

$$\tilde{H}_{s_i}|_{[\tilde{\Phi}]} = \alpha_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (5)$$

where the subscript $[\tilde{\Phi}]$ means that we have substituted H_{s_i} for $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Moreover, the functional independence of the original Hamiltonians H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, implies the functional independence of \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$. Indeed, the functional independence of H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, means that $\dim \text{span}(dH_i, i = 1, \dots, r) = r$ on another open dense subset U of M . Using (2), (3) and (4) we readily see that this implies $\dim \text{span}(dH_i, i = 1, \dots, r) = r$ on another open dense subset $\tilde{U} \subset U$ of M . In turn, the latter equality means nothing but the functional independence of \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$ we sought for.

Let us stress that here and below the differentials are computed under the assumption that the parameters are considered to be constant, i.e., if $H = H(x, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ then in the local coordinates x^b on M we have

$$dH = \sum_{b=1}^{\dim M} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x^b} dx^b.$$

By the implicit function theorem the condition (2) guarantees that we can solve (5) with respect to H_{s_j} , $j = 1, \dots, k$. If we do this and define the remaining Hamiltonians H_i by the formulas

$$H_i = \tilde{H}_i|_{[\tilde{\Phi}]}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad i \neq s_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (6)$$

then it is straightforward to verify that (3) and (4) hold identically. In other words, the formulas (5) and (6) define the inverse of the transformation defined using (3) and (4).

Clearly, these two transformations are dual, with the duality transformation swapping H_i and \tilde{H}_i for all $i = 1, \dots, r$ and swapping α_j and $\tilde{\alpha}_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$.

Note that in the special case when the Hamiltonians H_i are linear in the parameters α_j , the above formulas undergo considerable simplification, and we can explicitly express \tilde{H}_i via H_i .

Namely, let

$$H_i = H_i^{(0)} + \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j H_i^{(j)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r. \quad (7)$$

Then equations (3) take the form

$$H_{s_i}^{(0)} + \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{H}_{s_j} H_{s_i}^{(j)} = \tilde{\alpha}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (8)$$

and we can readily solve them for \tilde{H}_{s_i} :

$$\tilde{H}_{s_i} = \det W_i / \det W, \quad (9)$$

where W is a $k \times k$ matrix of the form

$$W = \begin{vmatrix} H_{s_1}^{(1)} & \dots & H_{s_1}^{(k)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ H_{s_k}^{(1)} & \dots & H_{s_k}^{(k)} \end{vmatrix},$$

and W_i are obtained from W by replacing $H_{s_j}^{(i)}$ by $H_{s_j}^{(0)} - \tilde{\alpha}_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$.

By (4) we have

$$\tilde{H}_i = H_i^{(0)} + \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{H}_{s_j} H_i^{(j)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad i \neq s_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (10)$$

where \tilde{H}_{s_i} are given by (9). It is straightforward to verify that if we set $k = 1$ then the transformation given by (9) and (10) becomes nothing but the standard Stäckel transform [11], also known as the coupling-constant metamorphosis [18].

3 Multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform and (super)integrability

It turns out that the k -parametric generalized Stäckel transform preserves the commutativity of the Hamiltonians H_i . More precisely, we have the following result:

Proposition 1 *Let H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, be functionally independent and let \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, be related to H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, by a k -parameter generalized Stäckel transform (3), (4) generated by H_{s_1}, \dots, H_{s_k} , where $k \leq \text{corank } P + (1/2) \text{rank } P$.*

Then the following assertions hold:

- i) if $\{H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ then $\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{s_j}\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, k$;*
- ii) suppose that i) holds and for a $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $j_0 \neq s_1, \dots, s_k$, we have $\{H_{s_i}, H_{j_0}\} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$; then $\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{j_0}\} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$;*
- iii) suppose that for a natural $m \leq \text{corank } P + (1/2) \text{rank } P$ we have an m -tuple of pairwise distinct integers $l_1, \dots, l_m \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $s_q \in \{l_1, \dots, l_m\}$ for all $q = 1, \dots, k$, and $\{H_{l_i}, H_{l_j}\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, m$; then $\{\tilde{H}_{l_i}, \tilde{H}_{l_j}\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, m$.*

Before we proceed with the proof of Proposition 1, some remarks are in order. First of all, $\text{corank } P + (1/2) \text{rank } P$ is easily seen to be the maximal possible number of functions in involution on M with respect to the Poisson bracket associated with P .

Next, from Proposition 1 it is immediate that the transformation defined by (3) and (4) preserves (super)integrability. Namely, under the assumptions of Proposition 1, iii) let $\dim M = 2n$, $\text{rank } P = 2n$, and $m = n$. Then the dynamical system associated with any of H_{l_i} is Liouville integrable, as it has n commuting functionally independent integrals, H_{l_j} , $j = 1, \dots, n$, in involution. By Proposition 1, iii) the dynamical system associated with any of \tilde{H}_{l_i} enjoys the same property, the required integrals of motion in involution now being \tilde{H}_{l_i} , $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Note that if under the assumptions of Proposition 1, iii) we have $\dim M = 2n$, $\text{rank } P = 2n$, and $m < n$ then, under some technical assumptions and in a suitable vicinity $U \subset M$, for the dynamical system associated with any of H_{l_i} , $i = 1, \dots, m$, there exists a symplectic submanifold fibred into m -dimensional invariant tori [27, 28, 17]. The tori in question are intersections of this symplectic submanifold with the common level surfaces of H_{l_i} , $i = 1, \dots, m$. Proposition 1, iii) implies that this property is preserved by the multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform defined by (3) and (4), i.e., for the dynamical system associated with any of \tilde{H}_{l_i} , $i = 1, \dots, m$, there exists, again under certain technical assumptions and in a suitable vicinity $\tilde{U} \subset M$, a symplectic submanifold fibred into m -dimensional invariant tori.

Now let $\dim M = 2n$, $\text{rank } P = 2n$, $r > n$, and suppose that $\{H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}\} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ and for all $j = 1, \dots, r$. Then the Hamiltonian H_{s_j} is superintegrable for any $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ as it has $r > n$ integrals of motion H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, and by Proposition 1, ii) the Hamiltonian \tilde{H}_{s_j} is superintegrable for any $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ as well, the integrals of motion now being \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Moreover, the multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform defined by (3) and (4) also preserves non-commutative integrability in the sense of [26, 9]. We start with the following result:

Proposition 2 *Under the assumptions of Proposition 1, iii) suppose that $\dim M = 2n$, P is nondegenerate ($\text{rank } P = 2n$), and the algebra \mathcal{F} of functions on M generated by H_1, \dots, H_r is closed under the Poisson bracket and is complete in the sense of [9]. Further suppose that $\ker\{\cdot, \cdot\}|_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_0$, where \mathcal{F}_0 is the algebra of functions on M generated by H_{l_1}, \dots, H_{l_m} .*

Then the algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ of functions on M generated by $\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_r$ is also closed under the Poisson bracket and complete.

Consider an algebra \mathcal{A} of functions on a *symplectic* manifold M and assume that \mathcal{A} is closed under the Poisson bracket. Recall (see [9] for precise definitions and further details) that the *differential dimension* $\text{ddim } \mathcal{A}$ of \mathcal{A} is, roughly speaking, the number of functionally independent generators of \mathcal{A} . The *differential index* $\text{dind } \mathcal{A}$ can be (informally) defined as $\text{dind } \mathcal{A} = \text{ddim } \ker\{, \}_{|\mathcal{A}}$, and \mathcal{A} is said to be *complete* [9] if $\text{ddim } \mathcal{A} + \text{dind } \mathcal{A} = \dim M$ on an open dense subset $U \subset M$.

Sketch of proof of Proposition 2. First of all, it is immediate that the algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ generated by $\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_r$ is also closed under the Poisson bracket. As we have already noticed in Section 2, the functional independence of H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, implies that of \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, and hence we have $\text{ddim } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \text{ddim } \mathcal{F} = r$. In turn, as $\ker\{, \}_{|\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_0$, we have $\text{dind } \mathcal{F} = \text{ddim } \mathcal{F}_0 = m$.

By Proposition 1, iii) we have $\{\tilde{H}_{l_i}, \tilde{H}_{l_j}\} = 0$, $i, j = 1, \dots, m$, so $\ker\{, \}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \supset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0$ is the algebra of functions on M generated by $\tilde{H}_{l_1}, \dots, \tilde{H}_{l_m}$. Therefore $\text{dind } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \geq \text{ddim } \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0 = m$. However, as we obviously have $\text{ddim } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} + \text{dind } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \leq \dim M$ and, on the other hand, we know from the above that $\text{ddim } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} + \text{dind } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \geq r + m = \dim M$, we conclude that $\text{ddim } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} + \text{dind } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \dim M$, and thus the algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is indeed complete. \square

Therefore, if under the assumptions of Proposition 2 there exists an integer $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $\{H_{i_0}, H_j\} = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, and thus the dynamical system associated with H_{i_0} is completely integrable in the noncommutative sense [26, 9], as this system possesses a complete algebra of integrals of motion, then so does the dynamical system associated with \tilde{H}_{i_0} .

Proof of Proposition 1. Prove i) first. For any smooth functions f and g on M that further depend on the parameters $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$, we have the following easy identities:

$$\{f|_{[\Phi]}, g\}|_{[\Phi]} = \{f, g\}|_{[\Phi]} + \sum_{j=1}^k (\partial f / \partial \alpha_j)|_{[\Phi]} \{\tilde{H}_{s_j}, g\}|_{[\Phi]}, \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{f|_{[\Phi]}, g|_{[\Phi]}\} &= \{f, g\}|_{[\Phi]} + \sum_{j=1}^k (\partial f / \partial \alpha_j)|_{[\Phi]} \{\tilde{H}_{s_j}, g\}|_{[\Phi]} + \sum_{j=1}^k (\partial g / \partial \alpha_j)|_{[\Phi]} \{f, \tilde{H}_{s_j}\}|_{[\Phi]} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^k (\partial f / \partial \alpha_i)|_{[\Phi]} (\partial g / \partial \alpha_j)|_{[\Phi]} \{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{s_j}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Using the assumption $\{H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}\} = 0$ and (3), we find that

$$0 = \{\tilde{\alpha}_i - H_{s_i}, \tilde{\alpha}_j - H_{s_j}\} = \{H_{s_i}|_{[\Phi]} - H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}|_{[\Phi]} - H_{s_j}\},$$

whence

$$\{H_{s_i}|_{[\Phi]} - H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}|_{[\Phi]} - H_{s_j}\}|_{[\Phi]} = 0.$$

Writing out the Poisson bracket on the left-hand side of the latter identity using (11) for the brackets $\{H_{s_i}|_{[\Phi]}, H_{s_j}\}|_{[\Phi]}$ and $\{H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}|_{[\Phi]}\}|_{[\Phi]}$ and (12) for the bracket $\{H_{s_i}|_{[\Phi]}, H_{s_j}|_{[\Phi]}\}$ we obtain

$$\sum_{p,q=1}^k (\partial H_{s_i} / \partial \alpha_p)|_{[\Phi]} (\partial H_{s_j} / \partial \alpha_q)|_{[\Phi]} \{\tilde{H}_{s_p}, \tilde{H}_{s_q}\}|_{[\Phi]} = 0,$$

whence using (2) we readily find that for all $p, q = 1, \dots, k$ we have

$$\{\tilde{H}_{s_p}, \tilde{H}_{s_q}\}|_{[\Phi]} = 0.$$

However, \tilde{H}_{s_p} are independent of α_q for all $q = 1, \dots, k$, so

$$\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{s_j}\} = \{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{s_j}\}|_{[\Phi]} = 0,$$

and the result follows.

As we have already proved i), to prove ii) we only need to show that if $\{H_{s_i}, H_{j_0}\} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ then $\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{j_0}\} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

As $\tilde{H}_i, i = 1, \dots, r$, are independent of α_p for all $p = 1, \dots, k$ by construction, we have

$$\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{j_0}\} = \{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]}.$$

Moreover, as $j_0 \neq s_p$ for all $p = 1, \dots, k$ by assumption, by virtue of (4) the relation $\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, \tilde{H}_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]} = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}|_{[\Phi]}\}|_{[\Phi]} = 0.$$

In turn, using (11) we can rewrite the Poisson bracket $\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}|_{[\Phi]}\}|_{[\Phi]}$ as follows:

$$\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}|_{[\Phi]}\}|_{[\Phi]} = \{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]} - \sum_{p=1}^k (\partial H_{j_0} / \partial \alpha_p)|_{[\Phi]} \{\tilde{H}_{s_p}, \tilde{H}_{s_i}\}|_{[\Phi]}$$

As $\{\tilde{H}_{s_p}, \tilde{H}_{s_i}\} = 0$ by i), we see that

$$\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}|_{[\Phi]}\}|_{[\Phi]} = \{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]}.$$

Now, in analogy with the proof of i), consider the identity

$$0 = \{\tilde{\alpha}_p, H_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]} = \{H_{s_p}|_{[\Phi]}, H_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]}.$$

Using (11) and our assumptions yields

$$0 = \{H_{s_p}|_{[\Phi]}, H_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]} = \sum_{i=1}^k (\partial H_{s_p} / \partial \alpha_i)|_{[\Phi]} \{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]}.$$

Finally, using (2) we conclude that

$$\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}\}|_{[\Phi]} = 0, \tag{13}$$

whence $\{\tilde{H}_{s_i}, H_{j_0}|_{[\Phi]}\}|_{[\Phi]} = 0$, and the result follows.

Part iii) is proved in analogy with ii). Namely, in view of i) and ii) we only need to prove that the conditions $\{H_{l_i}, H_{l_j}\} = 0, i, j = 1, \dots, m$ imply $\{\tilde{H}_{l_i}, \tilde{H}_{l_j}\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, m$ such that $l_i \neq s_p$ and $l_j \neq s_p$ for all $p = 1, \dots, k$.

If $l_i \neq s_p$ and $l_j \neq s_p$ for all $p = 1, \dots, k$ then we have

$$\{\tilde{H}_{l_i}, \tilde{H}_{l_j}\} = \{H_{l_i}|_{[\Phi]}, H_{l_j}|_{[\Phi]}\}.$$

Using (12) and (13) for $j_0 = l_i$ and $j_0 = l_j$ we readily find that

$$\{H_{l_i}|_{[\Phi]}, H_{l_j}|_{[\Phi]}\} = 0,$$

and the result follows. \square

Note that the computations in the above proof bear considerable resemblance to those in the theory of Hamiltonian systems with second-class constraints, see e.g. the classical book of Dirac [14].

4 Reciprocal transformations for the equations of motion

Recall that the equations of motion associated with a Hamiltonian H and a Poisson structure P on M read (see e.g. [3])

$$dx^b/dt_H = (X_H)^b, \quad b = 1, \dots, \dim M, \quad (14)$$

where x^b are local coordinates on M , $X_H = PdH$ is the Hamiltonian vector field associated with H , and t_H is the corresponding evolution parameter (time).

Throughout the rest of this section we tacitly assume that \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, are related to H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, through the k -parameter Stäckel transform (3), (4) generated by H_{s_1}, \dots, H_{s_k} .

Suppose that $\{H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, k$, and consider simultaneously the equations of motion (14) for the Hamiltonians H_{s_i} with the times t_{s_i} and for \tilde{H}_{s_i} with the times \tilde{t}_{s_i} :

$$dx^b/dt_{s_i} = (X_{H_{s_i}})^b, \quad b = 1, \dots, \dim M, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (15)$$

$$dx^b/d\tilde{t}_{s_i} = (X_{\tilde{H}_{s_i}})^b, \quad b = 1, \dots, \dim M, \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (16)$$

In analogy with [18] consider a *reciprocal transformation* (see e.g. [29, 31, 32] for general information on such transformations) relating the times t_{s_i} and \tilde{t}_{s_j} :

$$d\tilde{t}_{s_i} = - \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_j}}{\partial \alpha_i} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} dt_{s_j}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (17)$$

Proposition 3 *Suppose that $k \leq \text{corank } P + (1/2) \text{rank } P$ and $\{H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, k$, and consider the equations of motion (15) for H_{s_i} , $i = 1, \dots, k$, restricted onto the common level surface $N_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ of H_{s_i} , where*

$$N_{\tilde{\alpha}} = \{x \in M \mid H_{s_i}(x, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = \tilde{\alpha}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

Then the transformation (17) is well defined on these restricted equations of motion and sends them into the equations of motion (16) for \tilde{H}_{s_i} , $i = 1, \dots, k$, restricted onto the common level surface \tilde{N}_{α} of \tilde{H}_{s_i} , where

$$\tilde{N}_{\alpha} = \{x \in M \mid \tilde{H}_{s_i}(x, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k) = \alpha_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

Note that the level surfaces in question, \tilde{N}_{α} and $N_{\tilde{\alpha}}$, represent the *same* submanifold of M , i.e., $\tilde{N}_{\alpha} = N_{\tilde{\alpha}}$. This is readily verified using the relations (3) and (5).

Proof. First of all show that (17) is well-defined, that is, we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{t}_{s_i}}{\partial t_{s_p} \partial t_{s_q}} = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{t}_{s_i}}{\partial t_{s_q} \partial t_{s_p}}, \quad p, q = 1, \dots, k, \quad (18)$$

by virtue of equations (15) restricted onto $N_{\tilde{\alpha}}$.

Using (17) we find that (18) boils down to

$$\left(\frac{\partial \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_p}}{\partial \alpha_i} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]}}{\partial t_{s_q}} \right) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = \left(\frac{\partial \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_q}}{\partial \alpha_i} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]}}{\partial t_{s_p}} \right) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}}, \quad p, q = 1, \dots, k. \quad (19)$$

In turn, using (15) we readily find that (19) takes the form

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_p}}{\partial \alpha_i} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]}, H_{s_q} \right\} \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_q}}{\partial \alpha_i} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]}, H_{s_p} \right\} \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}},$$

and the latter equality can be proved by taking the partial derivative of the relation $\{H_{s_p}, H_{s_q}\} = 0$ with respect to α_i .

Next, Eq.(17) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt_{s_i}} = - \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial \alpha_j} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} \frac{d}{dt_{s_j}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Taking into account (15) and (16) we conclude that we have to prove that

$$X_{H_{s_i}}|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = - \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial \alpha_j} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} \right) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} X_{\tilde{H}_{s_j}}|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (20)$$

where $|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}}$ denotes restriction onto $N_{\tilde{\alpha}}$.

As $X_H = PdH$ for any smooth function H on M , Eq.(20) boils down to

$$\left(P \left(dH_{s_i} + \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial \alpha_j} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} d\tilde{H}_{s_j} \right) \right) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (21)$$

On the other hand, taking the differential of (3) we obtain

$$(dH_{s_i})|_{[\Phi]} + \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial \alpha_j} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} (d\tilde{H}_{s_j})|_{[\Phi]} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (22)$$

As \tilde{H}_{s_j} are independent of α_p , for all $p = 1, \dots, k$ we have $(d\tilde{H}_{s_j})|_{[\Phi]} = d\tilde{H}_{s_j}$, so (22) yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial \alpha_j} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} d\tilde{H}_{s_j} = -(dH_{s_i})|_{[\Phi]},$$

and (20) takes the form

$$(P(dH_{s_i} - (dH_{s_i})|_{[\Phi]})) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

In the local coordinates x^b on M we have

$$\begin{aligned} (P(dH_{s_i} - (dH_{s_i})|_{[\Phi]})) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} &= \left(P \left(\sum_{b=1}^{\dim M} \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} - \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} \right) dx^b \right) \right) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} \\ &= \sum_{b=1}^{\dim M} \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} - \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} \right) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} (Pdx^b) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

By virtue of (3) and (5) $N_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ and \tilde{N}_{α} represent the same submanifold of M , whence

$$\left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} - \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} \right) \Big|_{N_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} - \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{N}_{\alpha}} = \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{N}_{\alpha}} - \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{N}_{\alpha}} = 0.$$

We used here an easy identity

$$\left(\left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{N}_\alpha} = \left(\frac{\partial H_{s_i}}{\partial x^b} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{N}_\alpha}.$$

Thus, the left-hand side of (23), and therefore that of (21), vanishes, and the result follows. \square

Now assume that all H_i are in involution:

$$\{H_i, H_j\} = 0, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, r.$$

Then by Proposition 1,iii) so are \tilde{H}_i , i.e.,

$$\{\tilde{H}_i, \tilde{H}_j\} = 0, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, r,$$

and we can consider two sets of simultaneous evolutions,

$$dx^b/dt_i = (X_{H_i})^b, \quad b = 1, \dots, \dim M, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad (24)$$

$$dx^b/d\tilde{t}_i = (X_{\tilde{H}_i})^b, \quad b = 1, \dots, \dim M, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad (25)$$

and the following extension of (17):

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{t}_{s_i} &= - \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\frac{\partial H_j}{\partial \alpha_i} \right) \Big|_{[\Phi]} dt_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \\ \tilde{t}_q &= t_q, \quad q = 1, 2, \dots, r, \quad q \neq s_p \quad \text{for any } p = 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

In analogy with Proposition 3 we can prove the following result.

Proposition 4 *Suppose that $\{H_i, H_j\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, r$ and $r \leq \text{corank } P + (1/2) \text{rank } P$, and consider the equations of motion (24) for H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, restricted onto $N_{\tilde{\alpha}}$.*

Then the transformation (26) is well defined on these restricted equations of motion and sends them into the equations of motion (25) for \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, restricted onto \tilde{N}_α .

Note that the transformations from Propositions 3 and 4 do not change the dynamical variables x . In particular, under the assumptions of Proposition 3 for any given i from 1 to k the trajectories of the dynamical system associated with H_{s_i} are identical to those of the dynamical system associated with \tilde{H}_{s_i} , if we consider the trajectories as *non-parametrized* curves. In other words, the transformation (17) amounts to the reparametrization of the times associated with H_{s_j} for all $j = 1, \dots, k$. Notice, however, that in general the reparametrization in question is *different* for different trajectories, as one can readily infer from (17).

As a final remark note that it could be interesting to compare the above reparametrization results with those arising in the theory of projectively equivalent metrics [10, 34].

5 Canonical Poisson structure

In this section we tacitly assume that \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, are related to H_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, through the k -parameter Stäckel transform (3), (4) generated by H_{s_1}, \dots, H_{s_k} . We further assume that $M = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, P is a canonical Poisson structure on M , and λ_i, μ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, are the Darboux coordinates for P , i.e., $\{\lambda_i, \mu_j\} = \delta_{ij}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$. Then the Hamilton–Jacobi equations for H_i and \tilde{H}_i have a common solution, cf. [11]. Namely, we have the following generalization of the results of [11] to the case of multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform:

Proposition 5 Suppose that $\{H_{s_i}, H_{s_j}\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, k$. Let $S = S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_{s_1}, \dots, E_{s_k}, a_1, \dots, a_{n-k})$, where a_i are arbitrary constants, be a complete integral of the stationary Hamilton–Jacobi equation for the Hamiltonians $H_{s_i} = H_{s_i}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$,

$$H_{s_i}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \partial S / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = E_{s_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

If we set $E_{s_i} = \tilde{\alpha}_i$ and $\alpha_i = \tilde{E}_{s_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ then S also is a complete integral of the stationary Hamilton–Jacobi equation for the Hamiltonians $\tilde{H}_{s_i} = \tilde{H}_{s_i}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k)$,

$$\tilde{H}_{s_i}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \partial S / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k) = \tilde{E}_{s_i}.$$

Further assume that $r \leq n$, and $\{H_i, H_j\} = 0$, $i, j = 1, \dots, r$, and

$$S = S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_r, a_1, \dots, a_{n-r}) \quad (27)$$

where a_i are arbitrary constants, be a complete integral for the system of stationary Hamilton–Jacobi equations

$$H_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \partial S / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = E_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

If we set

$$\alpha_j = \tilde{E}_{s_j}, \quad E_{s_j} = \tilde{\alpha}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad \text{and} \quad E_i = \tilde{E}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad i \neq s_p \quad \text{for all} \quad p = 1, \dots, k,$$

then S (27) is also a complete integral for the system

$$\tilde{H}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \partial S / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k) = \tilde{E}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

This result suggests that the multiparametric generalized Stäckel transform potentially is a very powerful tool for solving the Hamilton–Jacobi equations (and hence the equations of motion) for Hamiltonian dynamical systems. Indeed, if we can solve the stationary Hamilton–Jacobi equations for the original Hamiltonians H_i , then by Proposition 5 we can do this for the transformed Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_i as well, and vice versa.

As for the equations of motion, in addition to general Propositions 3 and 4, a somewhat more explicit result can be obtained by straightforward computation:

Corollary 1 Suppose that $r = n$, $\{H_i, H_j\} = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $\partial^2 H_i / \partial \alpha_j \partial \boldsymbol{\mu} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and all $j = 1, \dots, k$, and that λ_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, can be chosen as local coordinates on the Lagrangian submanifold $N_E = \{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in M | H_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = E_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n\}$ (in other words, the system $H_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = E_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, can be solved for $\boldsymbol{\mu}$), and that we have

$$\alpha_j = \tilde{E}_{s_j}, \quad E_{s_j} = \tilde{\alpha}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad \text{and} \quad E_i = \tilde{E}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad i \neq s_p \quad \text{for all} \quad p = 1, \dots, k. \quad (28)$$

Then the reciprocal transformation (26) turns the system

$$d\boldsymbol{\lambda} / dt_i = (\partial H_i / \partial \boldsymbol{\mu})|_{N_E}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (29)$$

into

$$d\boldsymbol{\lambda} / d\tilde{t}_i = (\partial \tilde{H}_i / \partial \boldsymbol{\mu})|_{\tilde{N}_{\tilde{E}}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (30)$$

where $\tilde{N}_{\tilde{E}} = \{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in M | \tilde{H}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k) = \tilde{E}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

Recall that N_E and $N_{\tilde{E}}$ in fact represent *the same* Lagrangian submanifold of M , cf. the remark after Proposition 3.

For instance, if we have $k = 1$, $\alpha_1 \equiv \alpha$, $s_1 = s$, and take

$$H_i = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, G_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\boldsymbol{\mu}) + V_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) + \alpha W_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (31)$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) stands for the standard scalar product in \mathbb{R}^n and $G_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ are $n \times n$ matrices, then the system (29) reads

$$d\boldsymbol{\lambda}/dt_i = G_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\mathbf{M}, \quad (32)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \alpha, E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is a general solution of the system $H_i(\alpha, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = E_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

If we eliminate \mathbf{M} from (32) then we obtain the *dispersionless Killing systems* (cf. [5, 8, 15, 16])

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t_i} = G_i(G_s)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t_s}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s-1, s+1, \dots, n, \quad (33)$$

and the reciprocal transformation (26), which in our case reads

$$d\tilde{t}_s = -\sum_{i=1}^n W_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})dt_i, \quad \tilde{t}_i = t_i, \quad i \neq s,$$

turns (33) into

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\tilde{t}_i} = \tilde{G}_i(\tilde{G}_s)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\tilde{t}_s}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s-1, s+1, \dots, n, \quad (34)$$

where the quantities $\tilde{G}_s = -G_s/W_s$ and $\tilde{G}_i = G_i - W_i G_s/W_s$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, s-1, s+1, \dots, n$, are related to the Hamiltonians

$$\tilde{H}_i = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \tilde{G}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\boldsymbol{\mu}) + \tilde{V}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) + \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{W}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (35)$$

which are Stäckel-equivalent to H_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We can now apply Proposition 5 in order to obtain the solutions of equations of motion (29) and (30) as follows:

Corollary 2 *Under the assumptions of Corollary 1, suppose that*

$$S = S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n) \quad (36)$$

is a complete integral for the system of stationary Hamilton–Jacobi equations

$$H_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \partial S/\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = E_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then a general solution of (29) for $i = d$ can be written in implicit form as

$$\partial S/\partial E_j = \delta_{jd}t_d + b_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (37)$$

where b_j are arbitrary constants, and by virtue of (28) a general solution of (30) for $i = d$ can be written in implicit form as

$$\partial S/\partial \tilde{E}_j = \delta_{jd}\tilde{t}_d + b_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (38)$$

Comparing (37) and (38) and using (28) we readily see that, in perfect agreement with (26), $t_i = \tilde{t}_i$ for $i \neq s_1, \dots, s_k$, but $t_{s_j} = \partial S / \partial E_{s_j} - b_{s_j} = \partial S / \partial \tilde{\alpha}_j - b_{s_j}$ while $\tilde{t}_{s_j} = \partial S / \partial \tilde{E}_{s_j} - b_{s_j} = \partial S / \partial \alpha_j - b_{s_j}$. Thus, the above approach does not yield an *explicit* formula expressing \tilde{t}_{s_j} as functions of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}$, and t_{s_i} .

In order to find a complete integral (36) we can use separation of variables as follows (see e.g. [33, 7] and references therein). Under the assumptions of Corollary 2 suppose that $\lambda_i, \mu_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, are separation coordinates for the Hamiltonians $H_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, that is, the system of equations $H_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = E_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, is equivalent to the following one:

$$\varphi_i(\lambda_i, \mu_i, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (39)$$

which is nothing but the set of the separation relations¹ on the Lagrangian submanifold N_E .

On the other hand, under the identification (28) the system (39) is equivalent to

$$\tilde{H}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k) = \tilde{E}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (40)$$

Thus, the Stäckel-equivalent n -tuples of Hamiltonians share the separation relations (39) provided (28) holds.

Consider the system of stationary Hamilton–Jacobi equations for H_i

$$H_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \partial S / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = E_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (41)$$

By the above, (41) is equivalent to the system

$$\varphi_i(\lambda_i, \partial S / \partial \lambda_i, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (42)$$

Suppose that (39) can be solved for $\mu_i, i = 1, \dots, n$:

$$\mu_i = M_i(\lambda_i, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then there exists a separated complete integral of (42), and hence of (41), of the form (cf. e.g. [7])

$$S = \sum_{l=1}^n \int M_l(\lambda_l, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n) d\lambda_l, \quad (43)$$

and general solutions for (29) and (30) can be found using the method of Corollary 2.

In this case the formulas (37) take the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \int (\partial M_i(\lambda_i, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n) / \partial E_j) d\lambda_i = \delta_{jd} t_d + b_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (44)$$

and expressing λ_i as functions of t_d from (44) is nothing but an instance of the Jacobi inversion problem.

In particular, for $d = s_i$ we have

$$\tilde{t}_{s_i} + b_{s_i} = \partial S / \partial \tilde{E}_{s_i} = \partial S / \partial \alpha_i = \sum_{l=1}^n \int (\partial M_l(\lambda_l, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n) / \partial \alpha_i) d\lambda_l, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

¹Note that the separation relations involving parameters appear, in a rather different context, in the paper [37] where they are employed for the construction of separation variables.

6 Multiparameter generalized Stäckel transform and deformations of separation curves

Under the assumptions of Corollary 1, suppose that $\lambda_i, \mu_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, are *separation coordinates* for the n -tuple of commuting Hamiltonians $H_i, i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the Lagrangian submanifold N_E is defined by n separation relations (39). Further assume that all functions φ_i are identical:

$$\varphi_i = \varphi(\lambda_i, \mu_i, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (45)$$

Then relations (39) mean that the points $(\lambda_i, \mu_i), i = 1, \dots, n$, belong to the *separation curve* [33, 7]

$$\varphi(\lambda, \mu, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, E_1, \dots, E_n) = 0. \quad (46)$$

If the relations

$$\varphi(\lambda_i, \mu_i, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, H_1, \dots, H_n) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

uniquely determine the Hamiltonians H_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$, then for the sake of brevity we shall say that H_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$ have the *separation curve*

$$\varphi(\lambda, \mu, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, H_1, \dots, H_n) = 0. \quad (47)$$

Fixing values of all Hamiltonians $H_i = E_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, picks a particular Lagrangian submanifold from the Lagrangian foliation. It is also clear that the Stäckel-equivalent n -tuples of the Hamiltonians $H_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\tilde{H}_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, share the separation curve (47) provided (3) and (5) hold.

In the rest of this section we shall deal with a special class of separation curves of the form (cf. e.g. [7] and references therein)

$$\sum_{j=1}^n H_j \lambda^{\beta_j} = \psi(\lambda, \mu), \quad (48)$$

where β_j are arbitrary pairwise distinct non-negative integers, $\beta_1 > \beta_2 > \dots > \beta_n$. In fact one always can impose the normalization $\beta_n = 0$ by dividing the left- and right-hand side of (48) by λ^{β_n} if necessary, but we shall not impose this normalization in the present paper.

For a given n , each class of systems (48) is labelled by a sequence $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$ while a particular system from a class is given by a particular choice of $\psi(\lambda, \mu)$. In particular, the choice $\psi(\lambda, \mu) = \frac{1}{2}f(\lambda)\mu^2 + \gamma(\lambda)$ yields the well-known classical Stäckel systems. All these systems admit the separation of variables in the same coordinates (λ_i, μ_i) by construction.

We shall refer to the class with the separation curve

$$\sum_{j=1}^n H_j \lambda^{n-j} = \psi(\lambda, \mu) \quad (49)$$

as to the *seed class*. Note that if $\psi(\lambda, \mu) = \frac{1}{2}f(\lambda)\mu^2 + \gamma(\lambda)$ we obtain precisely the Benenti class of Stäckel systems [1, 2]. The seed class is a rather general one: it includes the majority of known integrable systems with natural Hamiltonians [7].

It turns out that, roughly speaking, the n -tuple of Hamiltonians having the general separation curve (48) can be related via a suitably chosen generalized multiparameter Stäckel transform to an n -tuple of

Hamiltonians having the separation curve (49) from the seed class. The exact picture is a bit more involved, as in fact we need to consider the *deformations* of the curves in question.

Define first an operator R_k^f that acts as follows:

$$R_k^f(F) = F + f\lambda^k - (\lambda^k/k!)(\partial^k F/\partial \lambda^k)|_{\lambda=0}.$$

For instance, we have

$$R_k^f\left(\sum_{j=0}^s a_j \lambda^j\right) = f\lambda^k + \sum_{j=0, j \neq k}^s a_j \lambda^j.$$

Now let

$$F_0 = \sum_{j=1}^n H_j \lambda^{n-j} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{F}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{H}_j \lambda^{n-j}.$$

For any integer m define [7] the so-called basic separable potentials $V_j^{(m)}$ by means of the relations

$$\lambda^m + \sum_{j=1}^n V_j^{(m)} \lambda^{n-j} = 0 \tag{50}$$

that must hold for $\lambda = \lambda_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Under the assumptions of Corollary 1, consider an n -tuple of commuting Hamiltonians of the form

$$H_i = H_i^{(0)} + \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j V_i^{(\gamma_j)}, \tag{51}$$

where γ_j , $j = 1, \dots, k$, are pairwise distinct integers.

Suppose that the Hamiltonians (51) have the separation curve of the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \lambda^{\gamma_j} + F_0 = \psi(\lambda, \mu), \tag{52}$$

where $\gamma_j > n - 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$, and $\gamma_i \neq \gamma_j$ if $i \neq j$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, k$.

Now pick $k \leq n$ distinct numbers $s_i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and define the Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_i by means of the following separation curve

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{H}_{s_j} \lambda^{\gamma_j} + R_{n-s_1}^{\tilde{\alpha}_1} \cdots R_{n-s_k}^{\tilde{\alpha}_k}(\tilde{F}_0) = \psi(\lambda, \mu). \tag{53}$$

This means that \tilde{H}_i are the solutions of the system of linear algebraic equations obtained from (53) upon substituting λ_i for λ and μ_i for μ into (53) for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proposition 6 *Under the above assumptions the n -tuple of Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, is Stäckel-equivalent to H_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

The n -parameter generalized Stäckel transform relating \tilde{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ to H_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ reads as follows:

$$\tilde{H}_{s_i} = \det B_i / \det B, \tag{54}$$

where

$$B = \left\| \begin{array}{ccc} V_{s_1}^{(\gamma_1)} & \cdots & V_{s_1}^{(\gamma_k)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ V_{s_k}^{(\gamma_1)} & \cdots & V_{s_k}^{(\gamma_k)} \end{array} \right\|$$

is a $k \times k$ matrix, and B_i are obtained from B by replacing $V_{s_j}^{(\gamma_i)}$ by $H_{s_j}^{(0)} - \tilde{\alpha}_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$;

$$\tilde{H}_i = H_i^{(0)} + \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{H}_{s_j} V_i^{(\gamma_j)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad i \neq s_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (55)$$

where \tilde{H}_{s_i} are given by (54).

Proof. First of all, note that the above formulas for \tilde{H}_i indeed constitute the Stäckel transform, as Eq.(54) is readily seen to imply the relations of the type (3), namely

$$H_{s_i}^{(0)} + \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{H}_{s_j} V_{s_i}^{(\gamma_j)} = \tilde{\alpha}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (56)$$

cf. the discussion after (8).

Now we only have to prove that the Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_i defined by (54) and (55) have the separation curve (53). As we have already mentioned above, the Stäckel-equivalent n -tuples of separable commuting Hamiltonians share the separation relations provided (28) holds. Therefore, in order to prove our claim it suffices to show that the separation curves (52) and (53) can be identified by virtue of (56).

Indeed, upon plugging into (52) the relations

$$\lambda^{\gamma_j} = - \sum_{p=1}^n V_p^{(\gamma_j)} \lambda^{n-p}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (57)$$

that follow from (50), collecting the coefficients at the powers of λ , and taking into account (51), the separation curve (52) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{j=1}^n H_j^{(0)} \lambda^{n-j} = \psi(\lambda, \mu). \quad (58)$$

On the other hand, plugging (57) into (53) and proceeding in a similar fashion as above, we obtain

$$- \sum_{p=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{H}_{s_j} V_p^{(\gamma_j)} \right) \lambda^{n-p} + R_{n-s_1}^{\tilde{\alpha}_1} \cdots R_{n-s_k}^{\tilde{\alpha}_k}(\tilde{F}_0) = \psi(\lambda, \mu). \quad (59)$$

By virtue of relations (56), which can be further rewritten as

$$H_{s_i}^{(0)} = - \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{H}_{s_j} V_i^{(\gamma_j)} + \tilde{\alpha}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

along with (55), we find that the curves (59) and (58) are indeed identical, and hence so are the curves (53) and (52). \square

Remark 1 In fact the above argument can be inverted, that is, we can obtain the relations (56) (and hence (54)) and (55) by requiring the curves (52) and (53) to coincide and comparing the coefficients at the powers of λ on the left-hand sides of these curves, or equivalently (by virtue of (50)), of (59) and (58).

Proposition 7 *The inverse of the k -parameter generalized Stäckel transform (54), (55) has the form:*

$$H_{s_i} = \det \tilde{B}_i / \det \tilde{B}, \quad (60)$$

where

$$\tilde{B} = \left\| \begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{V}_{s_1}^{(n-s_1)} & \dots & \tilde{V}_{s_1}^{(n-s_k)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tilde{V}_{s_k}^{(n-s_1)} & \dots & \tilde{V}_{s_k}^{(n-s_k)} \end{array} \right\|$$

is a $k \times k$ matrix, and \tilde{B}_i are obtained from \tilde{B} by replacing $\tilde{V}_{s_j}^{(n-s_i)}$ by $\tilde{H}_{s_j}^{(0)} - \alpha_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$;

$$H_i = \tilde{H}_i^{(0)} + \sum_{j=1}^k H_{s_j} \tilde{V}_i^{(n-s_j)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad i \neq s_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (61)$$

where H_{s_i} are given by (60) and $\tilde{V}_j^{(m)}$ are deformed separable potentials defined for all integer m except $m = \gamma_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, by means of the relations

$$\lambda^m + \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{V}_{s_j}^{(m)} \lambda^{\gamma_j} + \sum_{p=1, p \neq s_1, \dots, s_k}^n \tilde{V}_p^{(m)} \lambda^{n-p} = 0 \quad (62)$$

that must hold for $\lambda = \lambda_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

The proof of this result is readily obtained from that of Proposition 6 using the fact that the inverse of the n -parameter generalized Stäckel transform (54), (55) is nothing but the dual of the latter (see Section 2 for the definition of duality).

As a final remark, note that upon setting the parameters α_i and $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ to zero for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ the formulas (54) and (55) indeed relate the Hamiltonians H_i with the separation curve (49) and the Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_i with the separation curve (48). In this case we essentially recover the formulas from [7] relating the Hamiltonians from the seed class and from the so-called k -hole deformation thereof (in our language, the deformed systems are precisely those having the separation curve (48)) up to a suitable renumeration of the Hamiltonians \tilde{H}_i .

7 Examples

As a simple illustration of the above results, consider the Hamiltonian systems on a four-dimensional phase space $M = \mathbb{R}^4$ with the coordinates (p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) and canonical Poisson structure.

For our first example let $k = 1$, $r = 2$, $s_1 = 2$, $\alpha_1 \equiv \alpha$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_1 \equiv \tilde{\alpha}$. Consider the Hamiltonian

$$H_1 = \frac{1}{2}p_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}p_2^2 + \frac{\alpha(q_1^2 - q_2^2)}{q_2}p_2 - 2\alpha^2q_1^2,$$

which is Liouville integrable because it Poisson commutes with

$$H_2 = \frac{q_1p_2 - q_2p_1 - 2\alpha q_1q_2}{p_2}.$$

The above pair of commuting Hamiltonians was found by analogy with one of the models from [19].

The relation (3) in this case takes the form

$$\frac{q_1 p_2 - q_2 p_1 - 2\tilde{H}_2 q_1 q_2}{p_2} = \tilde{\alpha},$$

whence

$$\tilde{H}_2 = \frac{q_1 p_2 - q_2 p_1 - \tilde{\alpha} p_2}{2q_1 q_2},$$

and therefore by virtue of (4) we have

$$\tilde{H}_1 = \frac{q_1^2 + q_2^2 - 2\tilde{\alpha} q_1}{2q_1 q_2} p_1 p_2 + \frac{\tilde{\alpha}(q_1^2 - \tilde{\alpha} q_1 + q_2^2)}{2q_1 q_2^2} p_2^2.$$

By Proposition 1, ii) the relation $\{H_1, H_2\} = 0$ implies $\{\tilde{H}_1, \tilde{H}_2\} = 0$, so \tilde{H}_1 is Liouville integrable just like H_1 . Interestingly enough, in this example the generalized Stäckel transform sends the Hamiltonian H_1 into a natural *geodesic* Hamiltonian \tilde{H}_1 , but the metric associated with \tilde{H}_1 is not flat and, moreover, has nonconstant scalar curvature unlike the metric associated with H_1 .

By Proposition 3 the reciprocal transformation

$$\tilde{t}_1 = t_1, \quad d\tilde{t}_2 = \left(-2q_1 p_1 + \frac{(q_1^2 - 2\tilde{\alpha} q_1 + q_2^2) p_2}{q_2} \right) dt_1 + \frac{2q_1 q_2}{p_2} dt_2$$

takes the equations of motion for H_1 and H_2 , with the respective evolution parameters t_1 and t_2 , restricted onto the common level surface $N_{\tilde{\alpha}} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 | H_1(x, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \tilde{\alpha}_1, H_2(x, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \tilde{\alpha}_2\}$ into the equations of motion for \tilde{H}_1 and \tilde{H}_2 , with the respective evolution parameters \tilde{t}_1 and \tilde{t}_2 , restricted onto the common level surface $\tilde{N}_{\alpha} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 | \tilde{H}_1(x, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_2) = \alpha_1, \tilde{H}_2(x, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_2) = \alpha_2\}$. It is easily seen that \tilde{N}_{α} and $N_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ indeed represent the same submanifold of \mathbb{R}^4 .

For the second example we set $k = r = 2$ and consider the (extended) Hénon–Heiles system with the Hamiltonian

$$H_1 = \frac{1}{2} p_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} p_2^2 - \alpha_1 \left(q_1^3 + \frac{q_1 q_2^2}{2} \right) - \alpha_2 q_1,$$

which Poisson commutes with

$$H_2 = \frac{1}{2} q_2 p_1 p_2 - \frac{1}{2} q_1 p_2^2 - \alpha_1 \left(\frac{q_2^4}{16} + \frac{q_1^2 q_2^2}{4} \right) - \alpha_2 \frac{q_2^2}{4}.$$

The separation curve for the system in question belongs to the seed class and reads

$$\alpha_1 \lambda^4 + \alpha_2 \lambda^2 + H_1 \lambda + H_2 = \lambda \mu^2 / 2. \quad (63)$$

The separation coordinates (λ_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, are related to p 's and q 's by the formulas

$$q_1 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \quad q_2 = 2\sqrt{-\lambda_1 \lambda_2},$$

$$p_1 = \frac{\lambda_1 \mu_1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} + \frac{\lambda_2 \mu_2}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}, \quad p_2 = \sqrt{-\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} + \frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} \right).$$

Let $s_1 = 1$, $s_2 = 2$, $k = r = 2$. Then (51) and (54) yield the following deformation of H_1 and H_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_1 &= \frac{2}{q_1 q_2^2} p_1^2 - \frac{8}{q_2^3} p_1 p_2 - \frac{2(q_2^2 + 4q_1^2)}{q_1 q_2^4} p_2^2 - \frac{4}{q_1 q_2^2} \tilde{\alpha}_1 + \frac{16}{q_2^4} \tilde{\alpha}_2, \\ \tilde{H}_2 &= -\frac{4q_1^2 + q_2^2}{2q_1 q_2^2} p_1^2 - \frac{4(q_2^2 + 2q_1^2)}{q_2^3} p_1 p_2 + \frac{16q_1^4 + 12q_1^2 q_2^2 + q_2^4}{q_1 q_2^4} p_2^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{(q_2^2 + 4q_1^2)}{q_1 q_2^2} \alpha_1 - \frac{8(q_2^2 + 2q_1^2)}{q_2^4} \alpha_2. \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding separation curve reads (see Proposition 6)

$$\tilde{H}_1\lambda^4 + \tilde{H}_2\lambda^2 + \tilde{\alpha}_1\lambda + \tilde{\alpha}_2 = \lambda\mu^2/2. \quad (64)$$

Using Proposition 3 and proceeding in analogy with the previous example we readily find that the reciprocal transformation (26) for the equations of motion restricted onto the appropriate Lagrangian manifolds in our case takes the form

$$d\tilde{t}_1 = \left(q_1^3 + \frac{q_1q_2^2}{2}\right) dt_1 + \left(\frac{q_2^4}{16} + \frac{q_1^2q_2^2}{4}\right) dt_2, \quad d\tilde{t}_2 = q_1^2 dt_1 + \frac{q_2^2}{4} dt_2.$$

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the Czech Grant Agency (GAČR) under grant No. 201/04/0538, by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic (MŠMT ČR) under grant MSM 4781305904, by Silesian University in Opava under grant IGS 10/2007, and by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (MNiSW) of the Republic of Poland under the research grant No. N N202 4049 33.

A.S. appreciates warm hospitality of the Institute of Physics of the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland, where the present work was completed. A.S. would also like to thank Prof. A.V. Bolsinov, Prof. W. Miller, Jr, and Prof. S. Rauch-Wojciechowski for stimulating discussions and helpful comments. The authors thank the referees for useful suggestions.

References

- [1] S. Benenti, Orthogonal separable dynamical systems, in: Differential geometry and its applications (Opava, 1992), Math. Publ., **1**, Silesian University in Opava, Opava, 1993, pp.163–184; available online at <http://www.emis.de/proceedings/5ICDGA/>
- [2] S. Benenti, Intrinsic characterization of the variable separation in the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, J. Math. Phys. **38**, 6578–6602 (1997); preprint version available at <http://www2.dm.unito.it/~benenti/Ricerca/ICVS.pdf>
- [3] M. Błaszak, *Multi-Hamiltonian Theory of Dynamical Systems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin etc., 1998.
- [4] M. Błaszak, On separability of bi-Hamiltonian chain with degenerated Poisson structures, J. Math. Phys. **39**, 3213–3235 (1998).
- [5] M. Błaszak and Wen-Xiu Ma, Separable Hamiltonian equations on Riemann manifolds and related integrable hydrodynamic systems, J. Geom. Phys. **47**, 21–42 (2003); preprint nlin.SI/0209014 (arXiv.org)
- [6] M. Błaszak and A. Sergyeyev, Maximal superintegrability of Benenti systems, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, L1–L5 (2005); preprint nlin.SI/0412018 (arXiv.org)
- [7] M. Błaszak, Separable systems with quadratic in momenta first integrals, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, 1667–1685 (2005); preprint nlin.SI/0312025 (arXiv.org)
- [8] M. Błaszak and K. Marciniak, From Stäckel systems to integrable hierarchies of PDE's: Benenti class of separation relations, J. Math. Phys. **47**, 032904 (2006); preprint nlin.SI/0511062 (arXiv.org)

- [9] A.V. Bolsinov and B. Jovanović, Noncommutative integrability, moment map and geodesic flows, *Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry* **23**, 305–322 (2003); preprint math-ph/0109031 (arXiv.org)
- [10] A.V. Bolsinov and V.S. Matveev, Geometrical interpretation of Benenti systems, *J. Geom. Phys.* **44**, 489–506 (2003); preprint version available at <http://www-staff.lboro.ac.uk/~maab2/bolsinov2.pdf>
- [11] C.P. Boyer, E.G. Kalnins, and W. Miller, Jr., Stäckel-equivalent integrable Hamiltonian systems, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **17**, 778–797 (1986); see also <http://www.ima.umn.edu/~miller/stackel.pdf>
- [12] A. Cannas da Silva, *Lectures on Symplectic Geometry*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1764. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [13] M. Crampin and W. Sarlet, A class of non-conservative Lagrangian systems on Riemannian manifolds, *J. Math. Phys.* **42**, 4313–4326 (2001); preprint version of the paper available online at http://kraz.rug.ac.be/pub/tm/2001/2001_w_cofactor_jmp.ps
- [14] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*. Yeshiva Press, New York, 1964.
- [15] E.V. Ferapontov, Integration of weakly nonlinear hydrodynamic systems in Riemann invariants, *Phys. Lett. A* **158**, 112–118 (1991).
- [16] E.V. Ferapontov and A.P. Fordy, Separable Hamiltonians and integrable systems of hydrodynamic type, *J. Geom. Phys.* **21**, 169–182 (1997).
- [17] G. Gaeta, The Poincaré–Lyapunov–Nekhoroshev theorem, *Ann. Phys.* **297**, 157–173 (2002), preprint math-ph/0111033 (arXiv.org)
- [18] J. Hietarinta, B. Grammaticos and B. Dorizzi and A. Ramani, Coupling-Constant Metamorphosis and Duality between Integrable Hamiltonian Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 1707–1710 (1984).
- [19] J. Hietarinta, New Integrable Hamiltonians with Transcendental Invariants, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1057–1060 (1984).
- [20] E.G. Kalnins, J.M. Kress, W. Miller, Jr., P. Winternitz, Superintegrable systems in Darboux spaces, *J. Math. Phys.* **44**, 5811–5847 (2003); preprint version at <http://www.ima.umn.edu/preprints/jun2003/1929.pdf>
- [21] E.G. Kalnins, J.M. Kress, W. Miller, Jr. Second order superintegrable systems in conformally flat spaces. II. The classical two-dimensional Stäckel transform, *J. Math. Phys.* **46**, 053510 (2005); preprint version available at <http://www.ima.umn.edu/~miller/supstructure2.pdf>
- [22] E.G. Kalnins, J.M. Kress, W. Miller, Jr. Second order superintegrable systems in conformally flat spaces. V. The classical 3D Stäckel transform and 3D classification theory, *J. Math. Phys.* **47**, 043514 (2006); preprint version available at <http://www.ima.umn.edu/~miller/supstructure3.pdf>
- [23] E. Kalnins, *Separation of variables for Riemannian spaces of constant curvature*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1986. Online at <http://www.ima.umn.edu/~miller/variableseparation.html>
- [24] C. Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1970.
- [25] W. Miller, Jr., *Symmetry and separation of variables*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA etc., 1977; available online at <http://www.ima.umn.edu/~miller/separationofvariables.html>

- [26] A.S. Mishchenko and A.T. Fomenko, Generalized Liouville method of integration of Hamiltonian systems. *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **12**, 113–121 (1978).
- [27] N.N. Nekhoroshev, Action-angle variables and their generalization. *Trans. Mosc. Math. Soc.* **26**, 180–198 (1972).
- [28] N.N. Nekhoroshev, The Poincaré–Lyapunov–Liouville–Arnold theorem, *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **28** (1994), 128–129.
- [29] W. Oevel and C. Rogers, Gauge transformations and reciprocal links in (2+1) dimensions, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **5**, 299–330 (1993); preprint version available at http://math-www.uni-paderborn.de/~walter/publications/Gauges_2+1_13_4_93.ps
- [30] S. Rauch-Wojciechowski, K. Marciniak and M. Błaszak, Two Newton decompositions of stationary flows of KdV and Harry Dym hierarchies, *Physica A* **233**, 307–330 (1996); see also <http://www.itn.liu.se/~krzma/publications/>
- [31] C. Rogers and W.F. Shadwick, *Bäcklund Transformations and Their Applications*, Mathematics in Science and Engineering Series, New York, Academic Press, 1982.
- [32] B.L. Roždestvenskiĭ, N.N. Janenko, *Systems of Quasilinear Equations and Their Applications to Gas Dynamics*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 55, Providence, RI, AMS, 1983.
- [33] E.K. Sklyanin, Separation of variables—new trends, *Progr. Theoret. Phys. Suppl.* **118**, 35–60 (1995); preprint [solv-int/9504001](http://arxiv.org/abs/solv-int/9504001) (arXiv.org)
- [34] P. Topalov, Integrability Criterion of Geodesical Equivalence. Hierarchies, *Acta Appl. Math.* **59**, 271–298 (1999).
- [35] A.V. Tsiganov, Canonical transformations of the extended phase space, Toda lattices and the Stäckel family of integrable systems, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **33**, 4169–4182 (2000); preprint [solv-int/9909006](http://arxiv.org/abs/solv-int/9909006) (arXiv.org)
- [36] A.V. Tsiganov, The Maupertuis Principle and Canonical Transformations of the Extended Phase Space, *J. Nonlin. Math. Phys.* **8**, 157–182 (2001); preprint [solv-int/9909006](http://arxiv.org/abs/solv-int/9909006) (arXiv.org)
- [37] A.V. Tsyganov, Construction of separation variables for finite-dimensional integrable systems, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **128**, No. 2, 1007–1024 (2001).
- [38] A.P. Veselov, Time change in integrable systems, *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh.*, No. 5, 25–29 and 104 (1987), in Russian.